



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,737	03/04/2004	Sanjay Wangoo	66329/33336	6367
23380 7590 04/16/2009 TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP 1150 HUNTINGTON BUILDING 925 EUCLID AVENUE CLEVELAND, OH 44115-1414				
EXAMINER IBRAHIM, MOFIAMED				
ART UNIT 2444		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 04/16/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@tuckerellis.com

christopher.luoma@tuckerellis.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/675,737

**Applicant(s)**

WANGOO ET AL.

**Examiner**

MOHAMED IBRAHIM

**Art Unit**

2444

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to the communication filed on 01/29/2009.
2. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19 and 21-24 have been amended. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19 and 21-24 are still pending.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/29/2009 has been entered.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 01/29/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant, in substance, argues that the combined references fail to teach wherein the routing and distribution queue are separate from the device queue.
3. In response to applicant's argument, Applicant's attention is directed to Mastie reference which was utilized to address this particular feature, specifically, Figs. 1 and 2c. Fig. 1 clearly shows that the routing and distribution queue (printer manager 6) is

separate from the device queues (printers). Fig. 2c further shows that plurality of queues each associated with physical printer. In other words, when a print job is transmitted by a client machine, it is first received by the printer manager which in turns forwards the print jobs based on the attributes of the print job to various device queue that are associated with physical printers that will output the final product as described by the printer job ((see Mastie, figs. 1, 3, col. 2 lines 53-62 and col. 7 line 48-col. 8 line 6). Therefore, indeed the combined prior art of record shows wherein the routing and distribution queue are separate from the device queue, thus meeting the required scope of the claimed limitations as currently presented.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher 5897260 in view of Korfanta, U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0182575 A1 and further in view of Mastie et al. (Mastie), U. S. Patent No. 6498656.

Regarding claim 1, Zingher discloses a method for distributing a document to at least one destination (see e.g. col. 2 lines 35-40; a system for allocating printing jobs to

different destinations), the method comprising: receiving document data representative of an electronic document to be distributed (see e.g. col. 4 lines 7-21; a document for printing is received from a customer); creating a job by appending to the document at least one printer job language command, wherein the at least one printer job language command includes instructions for the distribution of the job by a document distribution queue and destination data specifically identifying at least one destination for distribution of the electronic document (see e.g. col. 4 line 67-col. 5 line15; print job along with parameters which define the print job are created); and distributing, on the basis of the printer job language command, the job to at least one destination (see col. 5 line 22- col. 6 line 18; printing job is processed and forwarded to destination based on the capability of the receiving machine).

Although Zingher discloses the inventions substantially as claimed it does not explicitly disclose communicating the electronic document and appended printer job language to the document distribution queue via data network; receiving, into the document distribution queue, the electronic document and appended printer job language; parsing, via the document distribution queue, the appended printer job language command from the electronic document and distributing the job inclusive of the print job language to at least one destination.

Korfanta teaches system for printing documents and transmission of such documents from a host device to a printer-related device over a network. In this system the desired document is wrapped in print job language (PJP) wrapper where the PJP commands adds control instructions to the individual print job. The document including the PJP

commands are sent to the printer-related device. When the print related device receives the document, it unwraps it from the PjL and prints the document (see paragraph [0023], [0028] and [0029]). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine the teachings of Korfanta with that of Zingher. Motivation for doing so would have been to enable the printing device to parse the instructions for printing the document while reducing the extra work of reinstructing the printer from the distribution module, in addition to providing more enhance security for the document.

Although the combination of Zingher and Korfanta disclose the invention substantially as claimed, they do not explicitly disclose associating each of a plurality of device queues with a unique document processing functionality and processing each job received into each destination queue in accordance with the document processing functionality associated therewith and associating each device queue with a document output destination.

Mastie teaches a system for routing print jobs to one of a plurality of print queues. When the system received a print job, it first parses though the attributes of the print job, determines if there are available logical printers that have compatible print attributes as the print job. Then the print job is routed to a print queue for the printer that has the capability of processing and printing the print job (see Mastie, figs. 1, 3, col. 2 lines 53-62 and col. 7 line 48-col. 8 line 6). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mastie with that of Zingher-Korfanta. Motivation for doing so would have been easily and efficiently

route the received print job to a printer that can handle the job (see Mastie, col. 1 lines 41-43).

Regarding claim 3, Zingher-Korfanta-Mastie teaches wherein the document distribution queue does not point to the document output destination (see e.g. col. 3 lines 62-67).

Regarding claim 5, Zingher-Korfanta-Mastie teaches further comprising, after reading the print job language command, distributing the job to a device queue by the document distribution queue, wherein the device queue points to the document output destination (see e.g. col. 3 line 52-col. 4 line 6).

Regarding claim 6, Zingher-Korfanta-Mastie teaches further comprising selecting the document output destination from the group consisting of an image forming device, an email system, a web publication system, and a document management system (see e.g. col. 4 lines 7-16 and col. 5 lines 2-9).

Regarding claim 7, Zingher-Korfanta teaches wherein the document is distributed to a plurality of document output destinations (see e.g. fig. 1 and col. 3 lines 25-39).

Regarding claim 8, Zingher-Korfanta-Mastie teaches wherein the document is distributed to a plurality of document output destinations (see e.g. fig. 1 and col. 3 lines 25-39).

Claim 9 lists all the same elements of claim 1, but in system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 9. The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 9.

Regarding claims 11, 13-16, these claims correspond the claims 3, 5-8 which are already addressed. Thus the same rejection equally applies to claims 11, 13-16.

Claim 17 lists all the same elements of claim 1, but in a computer-implemented form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1 applies equally as well to claim 17. The same motivation utilized in the combination of claim 1, equally applies as well to claim 17.

Regarding claims 19, 21-24, these claims correspond to claims 3, 5-8 therefore they are rejection for the same reasons.

#### ***Prior Art of Record***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please refer to form PTO-892 (Notice of Reference Cited) for a list of relevant prior art.



***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MOHAMED IBRAHIM whose telephone number is (571)270-1132. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William C. Vaughn, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mohamed Ibrahim/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2444

Application/Control Number: 10/675,737

Page 9

Art Unit: 2444

/Paul H Kang/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2444